

TRANSMITTAL SLIP		DATE 6/17/87
TO: D/ICS		
<div></div>		
<div></div>		
FROM: ER		
ROOM NO.	BUILDING	EXTENSION

FORM NO. 241
1 FEB 66

REPLACES FORM 36-8
WHICH MAY BE USED.

(47)

25X1

Declassified in Part - Sanitized Copy Approved for Release 2012/05/31 : CIA-RDP89M00699R001000600020-1

Page Denied



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS
WASHINGTON, DC 20350-2000

87-2255X/1

SECRET

IN REPLY REFER TO
3800
Ser 009/7S363019
05 June 1987

SECRET/NOT RELEASABLE TO FOREIGN NATIONALS (S/NF)

MEMORANDUM FOR THE CHAIRMAN, INTELLIGENCE RESEARCH AND
DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL (IR&DC)

SUBJ: DRAFT MINUTES OF THE 18 MAY 1987 IR&DC MEETING

1. (U) I offer the following in response to your request for comment on [] proposal for establishment of a small IC Staff R&D Group and increased usefulness of the IR&DC.

18 JUN 1987

25X1

(S) While cross talk on R&D programs among the NFIP Program Managers is highly desirable, I do not believe we need another staff element to establish and foster this practice. NSA, for example, is already conducting cross talk between CCP and TCP R&D programs to ensure complementary/non-redundant efforts which satisfy the individual operational requirements. I'm also aware that the IC Staff promotes cross talk between the GDIP and CCP under [] auspices.

25X1

(S) I agree with your comment that it is within the IR&DC purview to foster this communication. Perhaps the IR&DC charter could be amended to reflect this, although it is within the functions (para 2.c and 2.d) as now stated. By extension, the job of coordinating and sponsoring research could fall to the IR&DC Technical Advisory Forum (as with the Forum in 1984 for "R&D to Counter the Foreign Intelligence Threat").

(U) You may be aware that the GDIP staff has also surfaced a similar mini R&D staff concept paralleling [] I don't see how another layer in the bureaucracy can make a uniquely valuable contribution, at least within the naval intelligence and naval R&D communities. It appears we have the intelligence infrastructure to do the coordinating. Before we modify or add to it, we need to clearly identify what, if anything, isn't working.

25X1

2. (S) The IR&DC can better serve the community by devoting some effort to follow-up on some of the recently completed studies which examined or proposed technology fixes for continuing problems. Studies where more formal feedback is desirable are Counterterrorism, Low Intensity Conflict and especially the Intelligence R&D Initiatives of late 1986.

Classified by: OPNAVINST S5513.4B-5
Declassify on: OADR

W. O. STUDEMAN
Director of Naval
Intelligence

SECRET



Washington, D. C. 20505

DDS&T-350-87
10 June 1987

MEMORANDUM FOR: Chairman, Intelligence Research and Development Council

FROM: R. E. Hineman
Deputy Director for Science and Technology

SUBJECT: Intelligence Community R&D

REFERENCE: Draft Minutes of the 18 May 1987 Council Meeting

Don

1. This memorandum is in response to your request for comments on the proposed R&D function for the Intelligence Community Staff and for ways to make the work of the Council more useful to the DCI. I believe that any changes we make in the way we manage research and development in the Intelligence Community should be aimed at correcting specific weaknesses, such as better coordination, and not undertaken for the sake of generic "improvements". Community R&D is, in my opinion, in very good shape with many accomplishments to be proud of. The individual R&D programs of the NFIP are well conceived and implemented.

2. While these individual programs are well structured and represent the best judgment of experienced program managers, in the aggregate adjustments could be made to improve the overall NFIP. For example, individual programs are not always on par because one can not legislate or accurately predict innovations. As a result some very promising projects not making the cut in one agency could be competitive in another. Also, it is not obvious that in times of tight budgets individual programs will automatically preserve the appropriate level of R&D. Many individual decisions on resource allocations within the confines of one program taken without community consultation tend to penalize the R&D effort in the aggregate. Finally, there are the maverick ideas. These are proposals for speculative R&D that often are judged to be too far out when considered within a single program. There are some notable successes of this kind that were started under the now defunct DCI Production Enhancement Program. These are examples of issues that could profitably be considered at the Community level. They revolve around the programatics of the NFIP and so are best handled in the Intelligence Community Staff. I hasten to add that addressing them does not imply the creation of a special staff with a large budget but rather to facilitate coordination within the NFIP.

25X1

SECRET

SECRET

SUBJECT: Intelligence Community R&D

3. Regarding the Intelligence Research and Development Council, I see its mission across the Community as that of providing the DCI advice in technical depth on specific issues and on the state of the art in important technologies. The work of the Council has influenced the DCI on R&D matters since its inception. Within the past few years, for example, it had a decisive impact on research and development for Technical Security, Antiterrorism, and Artificial Intelligence. In short I do not see any need to modify the mission of the Council. It is doing exemplary work on its present track.



R. E. Hineman

25X1

SECRET